



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,436	03/08/2002	Tooru Hasegawa	020256	8773
38834	7590	03/23/2005	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2145

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,436	HASEGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 March 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/11/2002</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1, items DB1, DB2, DB3, DB4; Figure 2, items 14, 16; Figure 3, item DB. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 1, items P1 and P2; Figure 3, items 1, 2, P1, S8, 2b, 14, 1b; Figure 4, item 2; Figure 5, items 1, 2, P1 and P2. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2145

3. The drawings are objected to because Figures 4 and 5 have no reference characters included. Several items on Figures 1-3 are missing reference characters. Additionally, Figure 1 still has Japanese Kanji characters present that should have been removed and/or replaced during the translation process. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;

Art Unit: 2145

- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because extensive details of the specific invention are given. Applicant has included numerous reference numbers to the drawings within the abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-9 are directed to a traffic monitoring system and method. The claims are not directed to programs on computer-readable media. The claims state no computer hardware to execute any programs that might exist on computer-readable media. The claims could embody a group of persons standing on street corners analyzing motor traffic and reporting to a manager in their current claim embodiments. Applicant is strongly urged to severely rework the claims to embody computer hardware and computer executable instructions stored on computer readable media.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

Art Unit: 2145

351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mayton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,763,380).

10. In regard to claims 1 and 4, Mayton discloses a *plurality of active monitors each tapping a physical line on a network and analyzing traffic; and a manager collecting analysis results from said active monitors, respectively, wherein said manager comprises: means for loading a management application program for managing the respective active monitors to the manager itself; means for executing said management application program; means for delivering a traffic analysis program to each of said active monitors; and means for communicating with said active monitors, each of said active monitors comprises: means for loading the traffic analysis program delivered from said manager to the active monitor itself; means for executing said traffic analysis program; and means for communicating with said manager, and wherein each of said active monitors provides a traffic analysis result to said manager through said communication means in response to a request from said manager.* See Mayton, abstract; column 2, lines 24-25; column 2, lines 36-39; column 2, lines 42-45; column 3, lines 16-22; column 3, lines 24-25; column 3, lines 33-38; column 5, lines 40-65; column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 13; column 6, lines 52-60; column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 3. Mayton discloses active monitor nodes running a traffic monitoring program, analyzing traffic, and sending the results to the manager [console node] on a schedule [in response to a request]. Delivering a traffic analysis program to a monitor from a manager is considered inherent to the theory of active networking as defined by DARPA. By this rationale claims 1 and 4 are rejected.

11. In regard to claim 7, Mayton is applied as in claim 4. Mayton further disclose *said manager holds topology information concerned about the respective active monitors on a network, and manages traffic based on the analysis results collected from said respective active monitors and said topology information.* See Mayton, column 1, lines 15-32; column 2, lines 52-69; column 3, lines 33-46; column 6, lines 1-26; column 6, lines 52-56. By this rationale claim 7 is rejected.

Art Unit: 2145

12. In regard to claim 8, Mayton is applied as in claim 4. Mayton further discloses *changing operation parameters for the traffic analysis program, the traffic analysis program now being executed by each of the active monitors.* Mayton discloses a user controlling operations on a monitor. See Mayton, column 13, lines 44-49. By this rationale claim 8 is rejected.

13. In regard to claim 9, Mayton is applied as in claim 4. Mayton further discloses *each of said active monitors identifies a packet and a protocol under control of said traffic analysis program.* See Mayton, column 8, lines 44-63. By this rationale claim 9 is rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 2-3 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayton and Hanchett (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,301).

16. In regard to claims 2-3 and 5-6, Mayton is applied as in claims 1 and 4. Mayton fails to disclose unloading a network management program from a manager or a monitor. However, Hanchett discloses that each end node may install and uninstall software. See Hanchett, column 4, lines 15-20. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to remove any program from a computer, including network management software, such as a management application program and a traffic analysis program, if that program was no longer needed. It would further be obvious for a manager to unload a program since any other computer in the network can unload a program if not needed and the manager is a computer in the network. If the manager's management program is not needed, it would be

Art Unit: 2145

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to unload the management program from the manager to conserve system resources. By this rationale claims 2-3 and 5-6 are rejected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Martin-Wallace can be reached on 571-272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

V. Martin Wallace

VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

JRW